

CONFIDENTIAL

76/2121

12 FEBRUARY 1976

25X1A

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHIEF OF STATION, [REDACTED]

25X1A

SUBJECT : OTR AUDIT SURVEY

REFERENCE : MEMO TO DTR FROM C/AS/OIG DATED 20 JANUARY 1976,
SAME SUBJECT

1. I THINK I SPEAK FOR THE DD/O IN STATING THAT THE DD/O HAS NO PARTICULAR DESIRE TO ADMINISTRATIVELY CONTROL OPERATIONS TRAINING AT THE [REDACTED] OR IN ALT. WHAT HE DOES WANT IS RECOGNITION OF THE FACT THAT THE PRODUCT FROM OPERATIONS TRAINING COURSES WILL SERVE IN THE DO AND THE TYPE OF TRAINING AND THE QUALITY OF THE TRAINING MUST BE RESPONSIVE TO THE DO REQUIREMENT. TO INSURE THAT THIS IS DONE, THE FOLLOWING MECHANISM IS ALREADY IN EFFECT:

A. THE OPERATIONS TRAINING GROUP [REDACTED] IS UNDER THE EFFECTIVE DAY-TO-DAY SUPERVISION OF A DO OFFICER. 90% OF THE INSTRUCTOR STAFF ARE DO OFFICERS.

25X1A

B. THE DEPUTY FOR OPERATIONS TRAINING/TR HEADQUARTERS IS PLACED SO THAT HE CAN CONVEY THE POSITION OF THE DD/O TO OTR HEADQUARTERS IN RESPECT TO OPERATIONS TRAINING, BOTH [REDACTED] AND ALT, AND THOSE OTHER TRAINING ACTIVITIES THAT AFFECT THE DO; FOR EXAMPLE, MANAGEMENT COURSES, LANGUAGE TRAINING, ETC.

25X1A

C. THE DO TRAINING TASK FORCE IS A MECHANISM WHICH IS CAPABLE OF IDENTIFYING OPERATING DIVISION TRAINING NEEDS IN RESPECT TO OPERATIONS TRAINING COURSES. THIS TF SHOULD BE INSTITUTIONALIZED RATHER THAN OPERATE ON AN AD HOC BASIS AS IS NOW THE CASE.

2. MY EXPERIENCE SO FAR HAS SHOWN THAT OTR HAS NOT INTRUDED ITSELF INTO THE DAY-TO-DAY TRAINING ACTIVITIES IN OPERATIONS TRAINING. EXCEPT IN MINOR AND INSIGNIFICANT WAYS, OTR HAS DEFERRED TO DO DESIRES IN RESPECT TO WHAT SHOULD BE TAUGHT AND HOW MUCH OF IT SHOULD BE TAUGHT. TEACHING METHODOLOGY IS ANOTHER MATTER AND I BELIEVE OTR RIGHTFULLY CAN CLAIM TO EXPERTISE IN THIS FIELD. I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY SERIOUS DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OTR AND THE DO ON THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE. IN SUMMARY, THE DO IN FACT CONDUCTS THE TRAINING PRETTY MUCH AS IT SEES FIT, MORE BECAUSE THERE IS A COMMUNITY OF VIEWS BETWEEN THE DO AND OTR RATHER THAN ANY COMMAND RELATIONSHIP.

E2 IMPDET
CL BY 060604

25X1A

3. MR. NELSON HAS STATED, ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS, THAT HE HAS NO INTEREST IN ASSUMING MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE [REDACTED] SO LONG AS [REDACTED] AND OTR MANAGEMENT DO NOT BECOME SO INVOLVED IN OPERATIONS TRAINING ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS AS TO DETRACT FROM THE DO INPUT, I SEE NO POSSIBILITY THAT MR. NELSON WILL WANT TO TAKE OPERATIONS TRAINING UNDER HIS WING. BY THE SAME TOKEN, YOU COULD ALSO SAY THAT LANGUAGE TRAINING RESPONDS PRIMARILY, IF NOT COMPLETELY, TO DO REQUIREMENTS AND THUS SHOULD COME UNDER THE DO. MR. NELSON SURELY IS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ONE.

25X1A

25X1A

4. THE AUDIT REPORT IS INCORRECT IN STATING THAT THE DO HAS THE CAPABILITY TO PROVIDE ITS OWN OPS TRAINING. OF COURSE, THE DO CAN DO THIS BY REORGANIZING AND ESTABLISHING A TRAINING COMPONENT USING THE DO OFFICERS HERE AND IN ALT. IT WOULD ALSO NEED SPACE TO HANDLE THE TRAINING, I. E., [REDACTED] ET AL.

25X1A

25X1A
25X1A

5. AS FOR THE [REDACTED] PORTION OF THE REPORT, OPERATIONS TRAINING ACCOUNTS FOR ABOUT 50 - 60% OF THE FACILITY UTILIZATION AT THE [REDACTED] THIS DOES NOT MEAN, AT LEAST NOT TO ME, THAT BECAUSE OPERATIONS TRAINING UTILIZES THE FACILITIES MORE THAN ANY OTHER ACTIVITY THAT THE [REDACTED] MUST BE UNDER THE DO. IT DOES MEAN THAT DO EQUITIES MUST BE CONSIDERED. IF THE [REDACTED] BECOMES ESSENTIALLY A LOGISTICS BASE OR STATION RESPONDING PRIMARILY TO DDA REQUIREMENTS (NON-OPS TRAINING REQUIREMENTS), PERHAPS A LOG OFFICER OR AN M CAREERIST SHOULD BE THE COS. HOWEVER, IF THIS RESULTED IN EITHER TYPE OFFICER INTRUDING INTO MATTERS AFFECTING OPERATIONS TRAINING, THEN I BELIEVE WE HAVE THE BASIS FOR A PROBLEM DOWN THE LINE. IF THERE IS AN EQUAL DIVISION BETWEEN THE USE OF THIS INSTALLATION BETWEEN DO EQUITIES AND DA EQUITIES, I BELIEVE A DO OFFICER TO BE AS WELL QUALIFIED TO RUN THE [REDACTED] AS ANY OTHER OFFICER. IF OPERATIONS TRAINING IS SECONDARY IN THE SCALE OF PRIORITIES AT THE [REDACTED] THEN CLEARLY THE DO WILL HAVE TO ADJUST OR MOVE ELSEWHERE. I DO NOT SEE EITHER POSSIBILITIES OCCURRING. IN SUMMARY, THE CURRENT SYSTEM SEEMS TO BE WORKING WELL SO WHY FOOL WITH IT. IF THE DO PROGRAM IS BEING SHORTCHANGED AT THE [REDACTED] THERE IS AN ESTABLISHED MECHANISM TO BRING THIS TO THE ATTENTION OF THE DD/O, DTR, AND THE DD/A.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

DISTRIBUTION:

ORIG AND 1 - ADDRESSEE
1 - DEP/OPS

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

4 February 1976

STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief of Station [REDACTED]
SUBJECT : OTR Audit Survey
REFERENCE : Memo for DTR from C/AS/OIG, dtd 20 Jan 76,
same subject

1. Following are my comments regarding the subject survey:

a. The audit remarks regarding DDO training are certainly not the result of any new enlightenment. As you know, this has been a much discussed topic. I happen to agree that the responsibility should be DDO's. It follows, of course, that the DDO training personnel would have to keep up with training techniques, etc. Also the matter of whose budget (DDO or [REDACTED] would include what costs would have to be worked out. I believe the indication that the OTR Deputy for Ops training and the [REDACTED] Deputy for Ops positions might be eliminated is somewhat misleading. Certainly, the OTR position could go but the [REDACTED] Deputy for Ops (whatever one might call it) would have to remain and function essentially as the Dep/Ops does today. The chain of command would perhaps change in that the operations training would merely be satellited on [REDACTED] for administrative support.

b. Regarding the matter of the status of [REDACTED] I believe you know my feelings from past discussions. I believe the [REDACTED] should function directly under the DDA and the COS should be an "M" officer. An officer with a general knowledge of all DDA functions and a knowledge of DDO field activities would, in my opinion, be an ideal candidate. I assume they are using the term "logistical" in a broad sense. As you well know, the functions of the Support Group go far beyond the functions associated with the Office of Logistics. I point this out lest someone considers putting [REDACTED] under OL.

c. If one considers transferring Ops training to the DDO, then it seems to me the responsibility for MOTC should go to the DDO also.

2. In conclusion, if the questions raised are to be reviewed, the Audit Staff should, in my opinion, drop out. A joint task force or perhaps an additional task for the [REDACTED] group would be more appropriate.

Distribution:

Orig - COS

1 - D/Ops
1 - D/Sup

[REDACTED]
Deputy for Support

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

OTR AUDIT SURVEY

FROM:

CHIEF OF STATION

EXTENSION

NO.

OTR Form 1

A+B

OTR AUDIT

DATE

13 FEBRUARY 1976

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1.

DDTR
1026 C/C BLDG

2.

DTR
1026 C/C BLDG

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

PER INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE DTR, ATTACHED HERewith ARE THE COMMENTS OF THE DEPUTY FOR OPERATIONS AND DEPUTY FOR SUPPORT CONCERNING THE IG'S AUDIT SURVEY OF OTR. ALTHOUGH I FIND THAT THE DD/A HAS REPLIED TO THE AUDIT SURVEY, I AM FORWARDING THE AFOREMENTIONED COMMENTS FOR YOUR INFORMATION.

SA

25X1A

25X1A